Understanding MPU Usage in Microcontroller-based Systems in the Wild

Wei Zhou, Zhouqi Jiang, Le Guan









Introduction to Memory Protection Unit (MPU)

• MPU adoption in the wild

Common pitfalls and limitations in using MPU

• Mitigation suggestions

Summary and disclosure

$\mathbf{MMU} \text{ on } \mathbf{PC} \rightarrow \mathbf{MPU} \text{ on } \mathbf{MCU}$



華中科技大学

- The Memory Management Unit (MMU), a standard feature on traditional computing platforms, enforces page-based permission control (R/W/X).
- MMU is absent in resource-restricted microcontroller units (MCUs).
- As a stripped-down version of MMU, the Memory Protection Unit (MPU) provides basic security functions for MCUs, e.g., Arm Cortex-M series MCUs.

What is Memory Protection Unit (MPU)



- How MPU works?
 - For a limited number of configurable memory regions, MPU assigns access permissions (R/W/X) based on the current execution privilege level
 - A fault happens when a memory access violates the access permission
 - MPU can only be configured by privileged code



How to Program MPUs (PMSAv7)?



- MPU Control Register (MPU_CTRL)
 - Enable bit: enable the MPU
 - The PRIVDEFENA bit: enable the default memory map for privileged access
- MPU Region Base Address Register (MPU_RBAR)
 - Set the base address and the identifier of a memory region
- MPU Region Attribute/Size Register (RASR)
 - AP and XN bit: Set permissions (RWX) of a memory region in privileged and unprivileged level
 - **TEX, C and B bits:** Set the Attributes (e.g., cacheability and shareability) of a memory region
 - Size : Set the size of a memory region
- Constrains on MPU memory region
 - (1) At least 32 bytes (2) Power of two

(3) Must be aligned with 32 bytes (4) Limited region numbers (M0+/3/4 up to 8 and M7 up to 16)

What's new in MPUS (PMSAv8)?



- More MPU regions (up to 16 regions for both normal and secure world in M23 and M33)
- Use Start and Limit (end) address via separated MPU registers to define any size of memory regions, but still must be 32-byte aligned



 PMSAv8 also introduces a new memory attribute indirection register (MPU_MAIR), making it easier for multiple regions to share the same attribute, while at the same time maintaining their own access permissions.





Introduction to Memory Protection Unit (MPU)

• MPU adoption in the wild

Common pitfalls and limitations in using MPU

• Mitigation suggestions

Summary and disclosure

MPU-enabled common security functions



- Code Integrity Protection (CIP): Code regions can be set as non-writable to prevent code injection and manipulation.
- Data Execution Prevention (DEP): Data regions like stack or heap can be set non-executable
- Stack Guard (SG): A redzone can be placed at the task stack boundary to detect stack overflows.
- Kernel Memory Isolation (KMI): User mode (unprivileged) code cannot access any memory belonging to the kernel space without invoking system calls
- User Task Memory Isolation (TMI): User mode (unprivileged) tasks can only access its own memory except explicitly shared memory regions that belong to other tasks or kernel.
- Peripherals Isolation (PI): Peripheral access is restricted to tasks having the privilege to access it.

MPU adoption in the wild



ONGOOSE OS

Software > IT Management > IoT Operating Systems Best IoT Operating Systems of 2023 Micrium Sort: (i) Sponsored v Find and compare the best IoT Operating Systems in 2023 Zephyr Reset Filters (i) IoT Operating Systems X Use the comparison tool below to compare the top IoT Operating Systems on the market. You can filter results by user reviews, pricing, features, platform, RIOT THREA region, support options, integrations, and more VxWorks See Software Wind River \$18,500 / seat VxWorks®, a leading real-time operating platform in the industry, provides all the performance, reliability, safety and security MICROEJ IIN capabilities you need for the most critical infrastructure's embedded computing systems. VxWorks is a preemptive, deterministic RTOS that prioritizes real-time embedded applications. It has low latency and minimaliitter, VxWorks has many security features. Contiki APACHE **ARM**[°]mbed We did first comprehensive study vnewt NUCLEUS on MPU usage of top 30 IoT Windows IoT operating systems according to android market rating. things

Observation



TABLE I. SUMMARY OF MPU USAGE AND ADOPTION ON MCU OSS

			MPU Usage					
	OS	MPU Support	CIP	DEP	KMI	TMI	SG	PI
Open-source	Contiki [11]	None	-	- 1	-	-	-	-
	LiteOS [15]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RT-Thread 22	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OpenWrt [20]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TinyOS 5	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mongoose OS [17]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FreeRTOS 8	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FreeRTOS-MPU [7]	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	-	-
	RIoT 21	Optional	Default-off	-	-	-	Default-off	-
	Apache Mynewt [2]	Optional	Default-on	Default-on	-	-	-	-
	Zephyr [27]	Optional	Default-on	Default-on	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off
	MbedOS 9	Optional	Default-on	Default-on	-	-	-	-
	TizenRT [24]	Optional	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off	-
	CMSIS-Keil RTX 6	Optional	Default-off	Default-off	-	Default-off	-	Default-off
	Azure RTOS ThreadX [10]	Optional	Default-off	Default-off	Default-off	-	-	-
Proprietary	embOS [14]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Micrium OS [16]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Device OS [12]	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	VxWorks 26	None	-	-	-	-	-	-
	embOS-MPU 13	Mandatory	Mandatory	-	Mandatory	Mandatory	-	-
	NXP MQX RTOS [18]	Optional	Default-on	-	Default-on	Default-on	-	-
	Nucleus RTOS [19]	Optional	-	-	Default-on	Default-on	-	-
	SafeRTOS 23	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	Mandatory	Man		

- Only a few MCU OSs use MPU, especially
- Even if MPU is supported, only a few security-

We try to find out the reasons in this work.



• Why haven't MPUs been widely used in IoT operating systems?

Why do only a few OSs enable full-blown MPU-enable protection by default?

• How do the OSs implement MPU-enable protections in detail?

• Are MPU-enable protections effective?

Case Study : MPU-enabled RIoT



- RIoT runs all the code under privileged level, thus it can only provide some basic protections such as DEP, and stack guard (SG) with MPU
- Data Execution Prevention (DEP): RIoT enables the MPU region number 0 to cover the whole RAM region as non-executable
- Stack Guard (SG): RIoT sets last 32 bytes (the smallest MPU region) on the main stack as read-only via the MPU region number 1. Similarly, when switching to another task, RIoT configures the last 32 bytes of the target task stack as read-only.



Case Study : FreeRTOS-MPU





MEMORY

Tasks

Case Study : FreeRTOS-MPU



• Code Integrity Protection (CIP): All code regions including tasks, system calls and kernel cannot be written.

 Data Execution Prevention (DEP): All data regions including tasks, kernel, and peripheral regions are nonexecutable



Case Study : FreeRTOS-MPU



• User Task Memory Isolation (TMI):

Unprivileged tasks can only access their own stack and up to three user definable memory regions (three per task)

 Kernel Memory Isolation (KMI): The FreeRTOS kernel API and data are located in a region of Flash that can only be accessed while the microcontroller is in privileged mode (calling a system call causes a temporary switch to privileged mode)



Case Study : Zephyr

 Peripheral Isolation (PI): By default, a peripheral driver instance is considered as a kernel object. Therefore, its range is pre-configured to be inaccessible by user tasks. To access peripherals, a user task must invoke system calls.



🔊 華中科技大学

Case Study: Keil RTX CMSIS-Zone



- **TMI:** Based to user configuration, CMSIS-Zone assigns the access permission (RWX) to a bundle of memory regions and peripherals **as an isolated execution zone**.
- However, Keil RTX does not offer isolation between normal user tasks and the kernel (i.e., KMI is unsupported), so code and data of the kernel cannot be entirely hidden to user tasks.







Introduction to Memory Protection Unit (MPU)

• MPU adoption in the wild

Common pitfalls and limitations in using MPU

• Mitigation suggestions

Summary and disclosure

Common pitfalls in using MPU



• Weak protection

- Case study: Bypassing MPU protection in RIoT-MPU
- Case study: Privileged escalation in FreeRTOS-MPU
- Incomplete protection
- Prohibitive overhead
- Conflict with existing system designs
- Fragmented programming Interface



Bypassing MPU in MPU-enabled RIoT

- Bug: MPU can be disabled by control flow hijacking attack (e.g., ROP)
- Cause: MPU control registers (e.g., MPU_CTRL) are located in the system peripheral region, which can be accessed by any privileged code. RIoT also provides an easy-to-use driver APIs for MPU configurations (e.g., mpu_enable and mpu_disable driver APIs).

```
int mpu_disable(void) {
```

#if __MPU_PRESENT

```
MPU->CTRL &= ~MPU_CTRL_ENABLE_Msk;
```

return 0;

#else

return -1;

#endif

```
}
```



System call in FreeRTOS-MPU





Privilege escalation in FreeRTOS-MPU



- Bug1 (v10.4.5 and before): An unprivileged task can raise its privilege by calling the internal function xPortRaisePrivilege
- Cause: Privilege escalation function (xPortRaisePrivilege) is a kernel function which can be called directly

Patch (v10.4.6): Change it to macro implementation

Is problem solved?

#define xPortRaisePrivilege(xRuming	<pre>dcdecl MPU_vTaskDelay(TickTyp</pre>
<pre>{ /* Check whether the processor is already privileged. */ xRunningPrivileged = portIS_PRIVILEGED();</pre>	BaseType_t v5; // [sp+0h] [bp-10h TickType_t v6; // [sp+4h] [bp-Ch]
<pre>/* If the processor is not already privileged, raise privilege. */ if(xRunningPrivileged == pdFALSE) { portRAISE_PRIVILEGE(); }</pre>	<pre>v6 = xTicksToDelay; v5 = xIsPrivileged(); if (!v5) asm { SVC 2 } vTaskDelay(v6); if (!v5) vResetPrivilege();</pre>



Privilege escalation in FreeRTOS-MPU





Exploitation Steps





Patch



- Decide the original privilege level at the beginning using control register
- Introduced the portMEMORY_BARRIER macro to prevent instruction reordering when GCC link time optimization is used

```
void MPU vTaskDelay ( TickType t xTicksToDelay ) /* FREERTOS SYSTEM CALL */ {
    BaseType t xRunningPrivileged;
    if( portIS PRIVILEGED() == pdFALSE ) {
        portRAISE PRIVILEGE();
        portMEMORY BARRIER();
        xPortRaisePrivilege( xRunningPrivileged );
        vTaskDelay( xTicksToDelay );
        vPortResetPrivilege( xRunningPrivileged );
        portMEMORY BARRIER();
        portRESET PRIVILEGE();
        portMEMORY BARRIER();
    else
        vTaskDelay( xTicksToDelay );
```

Common pitfalls in using MPU



- Weak protection
 - Case study: Bypassing MPU protection in RIoT-MPU
 - Case study: Privileged escalation in FreeRTOS-MPU
- Incomplete protection
- Prohibitive overhead
- Conflict with existing system designs
- Fragmented Programming Interface

Incomplete protection



• Unsafe interrupt handlers

- Exception vector reads from the Vector Address Table always use the default system address map and are not subject to an MPU check
- Interrupt handlers (handle mode) run in the privileged mode, which can access any resources
- Incomplete protection for peripherals
 - Any load, store or instruction fetch transactions to the PPB, within the range 0xE000000-0xE00FFFFF (system peripherals), are not subject to an MPU check.
 - Due to the programming constrains (e.g., 32B granules and alignment requirement), MPU is not suitable for protecting peripherals with small regions

Incomplete protection



- Incomplete permissions assignment
 - No execute-only (XO) permission
 - Privileged permission ≥ Unprivileged permissions
- Arm MPU does not restrict peripherals as master, allowing them to access all memory (e.g., via DMA)

Prohibitive overhead



- To leverage MPU to realize kernel/task isolation, invocation to kernel APIs has to go through context switch twice
 - Our experiment shows that one thousand privilege switches in a FreeRTOS-MPU system <u>takes 3.5ms</u> on average on the MPS2+ FPGA prototyping system broad (Cortex-M4 AN386) with 25MHZ CPU clock frequency.
- MPU regions need to be re-configured for different tasks and applications.
 - FreeRTOS has to reset MPU regions #5-7 during an application switch
 - Tizen has to reset MPU regions #3-7 during an app (including multiple tasks) switch and #6 and #7 during a task switch

Conflict with exiting system design



- Limited MPU regions for real world applications
 - Very few available user-defined regions for peripheral isolation
 - No OS provides peripheral isolation by default.
 - Very few available regions shared between two tasks
 - No OS provides shared memory protection by default.
 - It is impossible to enable too many security features at same times
 - E.g., activating all MPU features in Tizen exhausts all MPU regions
- Porting software leveraging MPU may cause compatibility issues
 - Only 30% manufacturers implement MCU hardware security features in current designs

Fragmented Programming Interface



- Chip vendors may design customized MPUs, which provide better security guarantees, but impose a steep learning curve for developers
- This may discourage them from adopting MPUs or even lead to programming errors
- Case study: NXP's Kinetis series MCUs discard ARM MPU and integrate NXP's proprietary system MPU (i.e., sysMPU)
- It can restrict the permission of peripherals as masters
- When enabled, by default, peripherals cannot access RAM
- To use it, developers have to properly configure sysMPU. Otherwise, many official demos cannot execute





Introduction to Memory Protection Unit (MPU)

• MPU adoption in the wild

Common pitfalls and limitations in using MPU

Mitigation suggestions

Summary and disclosure

Minimizing pitfalls



- Be careful about permission overlap
 - **Observation:** all open-source OSs but the latest FreeRTOSv10.5 use lower-number MPU regions for kernel protections ().
 - **Risk:** Developer could configure those higher numbered user-defined MPU regions to override kernel protections.
 - **Recommendation:** System and general protection (e.g., KMI, DEP,CIP) should use higher-number MPU regions.

Minimizing pitfalls



- Be careful about privilege switch during system calls
 - **Observation:** OSs wrap the kernel APIs by temperately raising and dropping privilege (e.g., FreeRTOSv10.5.0 before).
 - Risk: Privilege escalation with control flow hijacking or a manipulable stack.
 - **Recommendation:** MCU OSs should provide a system call interface with software interrupts, similar to traditional OSs. Alternatively, they can enforce additional caller checks before system call invocations, and the kernel should make sure that the privilege is dropped after system calls.

Minimizing pitfalls



- Avoid over-privileged execution
 - Observation: OSs which only provide protections like Stack Guard, DEP and CIP, always run the whole system at the privileged level like RIoT.
 - **Risk:** Disabling the desired protections by reconfiguring MPUs with control flow hijacking attack.
 - Recommendation: System drop privilege whenever possible.

Region usage optimization



- Leverage the default MPU region on ARMv7-M
 - Default memory access permissions/attributes of memory regions is enforced by ARM without MPU
 - E.g., non-executable for standard and system peripheral regions
- Leverage sub-regions



Region Usage Optimization



- Leverage sub-regions
 - Save memory usage
 - Save MPU regions



Region Usage Optimization



- Automatically find optimized region allocation strategies
 - MINION (NDSS 2018)
 - ACES (USENIX Security 2018)



New Hardware Security Features



- ARMv8-M architecture extends the TrustZone technology to Cortex-M series. The secure regions can be used as additional regions and be assigned with higher privileged level beyond privileged level in normal world.
- Trustlite proposed **execution-aware MPU** which the not only validates data accesses (read/write/execute) but additionally considers the currently active instruction pointer as the subject performing the access.





Introduction to Memory Protection Unit (MPU)

• MPU adoption in the wild

Common pitfalls and limitations in using MPU

• Mitigation suggestions

Summary and disclosure





- To our surprise, we found that MPU as a ready-to-use security feature for protecting microcontroller is rarely used in real-world products
- We studied the source code of multiple MCU OSs to find explanations for this situation and eventually <u>identified some</u> <u>common pitfalls</u>.
- Some of the flaws are fundamental and not remedial in a short term
- We give recommendations for better use of MPU

Disclosure



- All bugs we demonstrated has been patched in latest FreeRTOS kernel
 - Security update Reference: <u>https://www.freertos.org/security/security_updates.html</u>
- RIoT developer team has acknowledged our finding, but the benefit of disabling access to the MPU or the `mpu_disable()` function without a userspace / kernelspace split is quite limited, only mildly increases the attack surface in the context of the attack model RIOT assumes.







